

ORIGINAL

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

(202) 429-7000
April 12, 1996

FACSIMILE
(202) 429-7049

(202) 429-4287

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

APR 12 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Re: WT Docket No. 95-157

Dear Mr. Caton:

Enclosed please find a transcript of the proceedings in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in the case of Association of Public Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission, argued February 2, 1996. This transcript should be included in the record in WT Docket No. 95-157 and supports other materials provided to Ms. Karen Brinkmann and Ms. Linda Kinney last week.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

James Webb

Suzanne Yelen

SY:daj

Enclosure

cc: Ms. Karen Brinkmann
Ms. Linda Kinney

No. of Discharges: 0+1

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

* * *

ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SAFETY
COMMUNICATIONS OFFICIALS-
INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
ET AL.,

Respondent.

No. 95-1104

Pages 1 thru 35

Washington, D. C.
February 2, 1996

MILLER REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

507 C Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-6666

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- - - - -X
ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SAFETY :
COMMUNICATION OFFICIALS-- :
INTERNATIONAL, INC., :
Petitioner, :
v. : No. 95-1104
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, :
ET AL, :
Respondent. :
- - - - -X

Friday, February 2, 1996

Washington, D.C.

The above-entitled matter came on for oral
argument, pursuant to notice, at 9:50 a.m.

BEFORE:

CHIEF JUDGE EDWARDS, CIRCUIT JUDGES WALD AND SILBERMAN
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE D.C. CIRCUIT

APPEARANCES:

JOHN D. LANE, ESQ.
Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick & Lane, Chartered
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 457-7800; on behalf of the Petitioner

JAMES M. CARR, ESQ.
Federal Communication Commission
Washington, D.C. 20552
(202) 906-6263; on behalf of the Respondent

C O N T E N T S

<u>ORAL ARGUMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE:</u>
John D. Lane, Esq., on behalf of the Petitioner	3
James M. Carr, Esq., on behalf of the Respondent	16
John D. Lane, Esq., on behalf of the Petitioner--Rebuttal	33

P R O C E E D I N G S

THE CLERK: No. 95-1104, Association of Public
Safety Communications Officials--International, Inc.,
Petitioner v. Federal Communication Commission, et al,
Respondent.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF JOHN D. LANE, ESQ.,

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

MR. LANE: Good morning, Your Honor.

I'm appearing here on behalf of the Petitioner.
This FCC case involving the reallocation of a large block of
frequencies, and probably the most valuable--largest and
probably the most valuable allocation proceeding that the
Commission has ever faced. It's a particularly difficult
one because it wasn't a new spectrum involved in this case
but it was a spectrum that was encumbered by a number of
licensees that occupied the spectrum, some of which, in the
parties that I represent here, were very important Public
Safety facilities throughout the United States.

The Commission, back in 1990, issued a policy
statement that they were going to try and clear out a block
of spectrum for new technologies. They put their staff to
work to try and identify an appropriate block of spectrum
and also where the present incumbents might be able to be
relocated. And in early 1991, the staff came out with their
complete study and the Commission immediately instituted a

1 notice of proposed rulemaking.

2 The staff made a couple of significant
3 recommendations. One of which there were certain broadcast
4 interests that were situated in this band and the staff
5 said, it might be too difficult to relocate them, so they
6 should probably be left there.

7 QUESTION: Mr. Lane, may I ask you a question that
8 isn't really explained in either brief, at least to the
9 point where I could understand it. I was trying to
10 visualize what it meant to be moved from one end of the
11 spectrum, one part of the spectrum to another. And since,
12 if I understand it correctly, there's no economic
13 consequences because the new occupier has to pay your
14 clients for all the costs of moving, whatever the hell that
15 means. I can't figure out what moving the spectrum means.
16 I am thinking of boxes and so on.

17 I know we all hate to move, but I couldn't figure
18 out what it was.

19 [Laughter.]

20 QUESTION: And it didn't, I even had some
21 difficulty understanding where the injury was. If you're
22 moved from one part of the spectrum to another part of the
23 spectrum and all your costs have to be paid by the movant--
24 you're the movee--what's, what's this case about?

25 MR. LANE: Okay. That's a good question. Let me

1 start this way. You're going from, in this case, simply
2 from 2 gigahertz all the way up to 6 gigahertz, that's 2
3 billion cycles up to 6 billion cycles. It's not the same.
4 It's not the same, it can't be made the same.

5 QUESTION: Mr. Lane, that was not apparent. You
6 have to assume that our knowledge of progression along the
7 megahertz continuum is not what your's is. Would you
8 explain why it makes any difference?

9 MR. LANE: Because there are different operating
10 conditions when you move up. Let me give you a simple
11 analogy.

12 Suppose this Court was ordered to vacate this
13 Court, and this courthouse, that a commercial developer
14 would come in, redevelop this and give you an identical
15 courthouse, just what you have today, in another part of
16 this city. And you'd be forced to do this.

17 First, the Court would have to deal with the
18 situation of negotiating, would have to get experts in,
19 would have to make sure that the plans and specs and,
20 furthermore--

21 QUESTION: But, wait, counsel, apart from that, is
22 there anything more to it, other than the inconvenience--

23 MR. LANE: Yes, there is.

24 QUESTION: You have got to get to the point
25 quickly because you are running out of time. For example,

1 would we be moved to a place where we had no parking or it
2 was difficult to get there, or the light was bad, or we
3 couldn't get a telephone service? What are you talking
4 about?

5 MR. LANE: When you move--

6 QUESTION: I will tell you why it's important
7 because if you told the Chief Judge, who is desperately
8 trying to get an expansion of our building, that his costs
9 are taken care of, he doesn't care about anything else.

10 MR. LANE: But his operating costs, if you had to
11 put in a heating and ventilating system in a new building
12 that costs three times--

13 QUESTION: Well, what does that have to do with
14 moving on the--no, Mr. Lane, tell us why there's an
15 inconvenience in moving along the spectrum.

16 MR. LANE: Any move is inconvenient but, secondly
17 if you have to go to a less desirable band in the spectrum--

18 QUESTION: Why is it less desirable? You didn't
19 explain that.

20 MR. LANE: Because it costs more to operate up
21 there.

22 QUESTION: The operating costs.

23 MR. LANE: Yes, the operating costs.

24 QUESTION: Well, you never said that in your
25 brief, never at any point in the brief.

1 MR. LANE: Oh, I believe we have, we have made
2 that point. And as a matter of fact--

3 QUESTION: Where, where?

4 QUESTION: Where is that in the record that the
5 operating costs are appreciably different?

6 MR. LANE: Well, it runs throughout the record.

7 QUESTION: Well, if it does then you ought to be
8 able to pick a page randomly and it should be there, but I
9 don't remember it. I don't doubt that it is there, but none
10 of us are catching it. In other words, that would be the
11 kind of thing that we would immediately look for and find if
12 you're making an argument that, look, if you move us to a
13 different band, increasing--

14 MR. LANE: Well, it's a three-fold increase in
15 power when you move up from 2 to 6.

16 QUESTION: But if the FCC--I have just got to get
17 this point--if the FCC and I will certainly ask the FCC,
18 counsel--says that part of the agreement on any mandatory
19 moving would be the relocation facilities must be fully
20 comparable to the ones being replaced, would that not
21 include the same level of operating costs?

22 MR. LANE: No. There's no provision for future
23 operating costs. And, and--

24 QUESTION: Well, what is fully comparable mean?

25 MR. LANE: We don't know. And we're very

1 concerned. See, let me get to the point, we are not opposed
2 to moving, we just don't want to move with a gun to our
3 head. We're not opposed to PCS. We're not opposed to new
4 technologies. And the Commission found that we had special
5 operational and economic considerations that warranted
6 protection all the way through.

7 QUESTION: You want an optional move if somebody
8 can make a deal with somebody else and it's nice, but if you
9 just don't feel like moving, you can stay where you are? I
10 mean is that what you think is the right solution here?

11 MR. LANE: I think our solution is we will
12 cooperate. We have not said that we wouldn't negotiate. If
13 we can get a better deal and you can get a better courthouse
14 you will go.

15 If we can get a better--

16 QUESTION: In other words, you want the leverage
17 to negotiate with someone else, but--

18 MR. LANE: The Commission gave us that.

19 QUESTION: Yes, you want that leverage and you can
20 charge certain things for the privilege of somebody
21 occupying your place in the spectrum and moving somewhere
22 else. So you have lost the opportunity costs to charge
23 these people, is that what this case is about?

24 MR. LANE: Essentially, yes.

25 QUESTION: Well, then why should we care? Why

1 should we care? Where is it written in the statutes that
2 you are dealing with that you are entitled to the
3 opportunity costs to charge somebody to move to a different
4 place on the spectrum?

5 MR. LANE: The Commission gave us that and based
6 on findings that it was important that we had special--

7 QUESTION: But they also said that they could
8 revisit the issue. They didn't give you anything fixed in
9 stone. They said they can come back.

10 MR. LANE: Oh, yes, certainly. And I'm not--the
11 Commission has broad discretion. In these cases where they
12 say that for technical reasons and using their technical
13 expertise that they need a record, they need a technical
14 record.

15 QUESTION: But the FCC shouldn't even consider
16 that. If you came before the FCC and said that look, we
17 understand we are going to move, you want us to move to a
18 different place on the spectrum, we understand you say our
19 facilities have to be fully comparable--which, to me, seems
20 like it covers operating costs and we will, therefore, be
21 immunized against any diminution in our quality. But what
22 you are taking away from us is the ability to charge, in
23 economic terms, rents from the new people who want to come
24 in so we lose our monopoly rent-gouging opportunity and it's
25 unfair of you to take that away from us.

1 If you made that argument to the FCC and they
2 accepted it they would be reversed in a heartbeat.

3 MR. LANE: We never said we were going to try to
4 gouge anyone, Your Honor.

5 QUESTION: No, but I'm trying to say that the only
6 interest that you are suggesting here is the interest in
7 charging somebody for your place in the spectrum.

8 MR. LANE: We are saying that we can share and if
9 it comes to the point where we can't share, we will
10 negotiate. But the Commission found that we--there were
11 special considerations when you are dealing with these types
12 of systems. These were elaborate, sophisticated systems.
13 They found that we were deserving, they have reaffirmed
14 that. And the parties in this case, no one ever challenged
15 it. No one ever--

16 QUESTION: They don't challenge the significance
17 of it now and they say you will get protected moves. You
18 have a longer period of time and--

19 MR. LANE: But they were willing to live with it.
20 As a matter of fact, the--

21 QUESTION: But, counsel, that just can't fly in
22 the world in which we operate. Agencies change their mind
23 all the time. You don't have anything fixed in stone.

24 MR. LANE: But they have to do it based on a
25 record and have a rational explanation. They don't have it

1 here. They just are on their own motion took 180 degrees in
2 the opposite direction.

3 QUESTION: They got some comments in after--they
4 got some new comments in after the first order came out
5 suggesting that the interference problem was more
6 significant and than they were willing to credit initially.
7 And they simply said--and why can't an agency say, why can't
8 decision makers say, we're looking--let's assume it's
9 exactly the same information--why can't they look at it
10 again and say, we simply didn't read it correctly the first
11 time?

12 MR. LANE: They could.

13 QUESTION: That's what they did. That's what
14 you're arguing.

15 MR. LANE: Your Honor, they didn't. They looked
16 at that and they reaffirmed it and what they did, their
17 response was to cut down the exemption so that it just
18 applied to police, fire and emergency medical which changed
19 the universe that was affected.

20 They reaffirmed it.

21 QUESTION: Well, of course, you have a first rule
22 and order in October 16, 1992. And then you got a second
23 one August 13, 1992. And then a third one on August 13,
24 1992, and then you have responses to the third one by APC
25 and Cox.

1 MR. LANE: Right.

2 QUESTION: And they raise the points which lead
3 the Commission to say, oh, gosh, we should have thought
4 harder about that. Now, you argue that APC and Cox's new
5 points were really raised before, right?

6 MR. LANE: No. APC and--

7 QUESTION: But it doesn't matter if they raised
8 them in a different way and it caused the FCC to think
9 harder about it and they said to themselves, gee, you know,
10 we are, there's not going to be room at this end of the
11 spectrum for the new guys, the new high-technology people as
12 well as your clients.

13 MR. LANE: But they accepted it. They said that
14 it presented, look at the Joint Appendix at 330, there is
15 Cox saying that this represents--when the Commission had
16 reaffirmed the Public Safety exemption and cut it back to
17 the bare essentials--they said this represents a fair
18 balance and is supported by public policy and they said this
19 protects--

20 QUESTION: That's a fair proposition but it
21 doesn't really matter what exactly Cox's position and APC's
22 position was in the response to the third report and order.
23 The point is that they raised some notions which led the
24 Commission to think harder about what they'd done.

25 MR. LANE: But the Commission didn't say that.

1 That was counsel's brief that said, oh, way back then, they
2 began to be concerned, worried. That's just, that's just
3 counsel rhetoric.

4 QUESTION: Well, it's obvious the Commission was
5 trying to come out with a right balance on this all along.

6 MR. LANE: Yes, and they came out the right way.
7 We accepted it and so did Cox, so did UTAM here, did not
8 object to it, and so did APC, they accepted it. When they
9 say that the decision recognizes that microwave incumbents
10 providing services that directly and predominantly protect
11 lives and property cannot risk any possibility of service
12 disruption or inconvenience. They--

13 QUESTION: Counsel, we come back to the original
14 point. What's the disruption that you will face that will
15 adversely affect the public services being offered? And to
16 this moment I haven't the faintest idea what you're talking
17 about.

18 MR. LANE: I'm sorry but--

19 QUESTION: You mentioned operating costs, but you
20 cite us to nothing. I accept that as a possibility without
21 a citation to this moment. What else?

22 MR. LANE: People have to take away from their
23 Public Safety jobs and sit down and work and negotiate and
24 try to and move. That is a big, big undertaking.

25 Secondly, they have--I have talked about

1 additional--

2 QUESTION: In other words, the way to handle that,
3 you move, you leave town and have your wife handle
4 it. [Laughter.]

5 MR. LANE: It ain't that easy.

6 QUESTION: Isn't it fair to say, before you go on
7 to answer to the Chief Judge's question, I want you to, but
8 with respect to the operating costs you would certainly have
9 an opportunity down the line, if you ended up with higher
10 operating costs to claim that that's not fully comparable
11 within the meaning of the FCC's order, is that correct?

12 MR. LANE: I don't know where you go down the line
13 once you have one of these deals and move.

14 QUESTION: After a year--it's in the policy--
15 within one year the Public Safety operation may relocate
16 back to its original facilities with one year and remain
17 there until complete equivalency is attained.

18 MR. LANE: But that's a lawsuit and an enormous
19 dispute.

20 QUESTION: Well, yes, I know we are talking
21 transactional costs. I understand that.

22 QUESTION: But it is a rightness question, isn't
23 it? If the FCC is promising you fully comparable and you're
24 worried your operating costs may be higher and the FCC said,
25 well, that's silly we said fully comparable, fully

1 comparable means fully comparable. If they have a problem
2 with their operating costs being higher it's not fully
3 comparable and, therefore, they would be entitled to
4 compensation.

5 MR. LANE: Your Honor, excuse me for interrupting
6 but they have already started a proceeding to cut back on
7 these and they have already had a proceeding. It is in our
8 brief, it's referred to, there's a proceeding already to cut
9 back on these protections.

10 See, you start off with the fact that the
11 Commission--

12 QUESTION: Forgive me for interrupting on that
13 because you were answering Judge Edwards and I just wanted
14 to nail down my understanding of fully comparable. You were
15 giving him the reasons why you thought there was disruption.
16 You started with operating costs and you and then you had
17 psychological disruptions when you moved. Now, what else do
18 you have?

19 QUESTION: I mean is this about--and I don't mean
20 this facetiously--is this about the fact that we ought to
21 recognize that local governments just don't operate
22 smoothly?

23 And any big problem is much worse for them than in
24 private industry, is that what this case is about?

25 MR. LANE: I think that's part of it. I think

1 that is. They have multi-layered authorities. You know,
2 the guy running the police system can't sell the police
3 system, he can't negotiate it. It has to go through--

4 QUESTION: Well, I say that's hard for us to
5 understand because we don't see that problem in D.C. We run
6 efficiently but--

7 [Laughter.]

8 QUESTION: --but let me give you a little time.

9 MR. LANE: The Commission found that we have
10 special problems and special needs and also don't forget
11 this is the highest priority user of the spectrum. And,
12 therefore, the Commission has a special duty and the
13 Commission was exercising that duty and all of a sudden--
14 because a new Chairman comes in and a whole new ball game
15 where--you are auctioning this stuff off at \$7.7 billion for
16 only 60 megahertz of this, all of a sudden they forget about
17 those special considerations and the high priority.

18 QUESTION: Okay, your time has expired, counsel.
19 I will give you some time on rebuttal.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. LANE: Thank you.

22 ORAL ARGUMENT OF JAMES M. CARR, ESQ.

23 ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT

24 MR. CARR: Thank you, and may it please the Court.

25 QUESTION: Why don't you start off, counsel,

1 telling us, where is it that the Commission clearly
2 identifies something as new to them in this record that
3 causes them to change their mind?

4 What is it that the Commission has found that you
5 point to in the record that now causes them to see the
6 light?

7 MR. CARR: Well, the Commission in the memorandum-

8 -

9 QUESTION: Well, let me tell you what prompts the
10 question.

11 MR. CARR: Sure.

12 QUESTION: Some of the comments that you cite are
13 patently ridiculous because they are applauding the rule
14 that has now been removed. So it is pretty silly when I
15 look to those commentators and those commentators are
16 saying, we think the compromise struck previously is
17 terrific. And you are citing them as the Commission's
18 justification for a new rule, that can't be the basis. If
19 it is then you should lose pretty quickly.

20 So what is the basis?

21 MR. CARR: Well, I think, Your Honor, that the
22 comments that the Commission did cite pointed out that there
23 were some potential problems.

24 QUESTION: Yes, but if they end up saying this is
25 a great solution, I don't know how you can rely on those

1 kind of comments.

2 MR. CARR: Well, certainly Roman Apple did not
3 regard the exemption of Public Safety licensees as a great
4 solution. They perceived that there could be serious
5 problems with the development of unlicensed of PCS devices
6 unless--

7 QUESTION: Well, but that can't be your best shot.
8 That someone perceived something and the Commission says,
9 well, but one of the commentators perceived something, we
10 don't know whether their perception is right. What is it,
11 what is the Commission looking at?

12 Because 2-of-3 or 3-of-4 of the commentators end
13 up saying it is fine. So you have one you're citing, is
14 that it, and what does that one point to as evidence or as
15 something upon which the Commission can base a reasonable
16 prediction which would cause them to do what they have done?

17 MR. CARR: Well, I think even Cox and APC who said
18 that it was a reasonable balance, nonetheless, said that
19 they were already, they were going to have some difficulties
20 in accommodating Public Safety licensees and offering PCS.

21 And so it wasn't, while they didn't come right out
22 and advocate a change in the balance, they were
23 acknowledging that there would be some difficulties.

24 And the Commission, I think, also points out in
25 the memorandum of opinion and order that--

1 QUESTION: Would be or could be?

2 MR. CARR: Could be problematic.

3 QUESTION: Yes.

4 MR. CARR: And I think the Commission also points
5 out in the memorandum of opinion and order that it was, at
6 that point, well accepted that there could not be spectrum
7 sharing in the sense that APCO is now suggesting. That is,
8 there could not be a situation where two services could be
9 offered at the same time on the same frequency in the same
10 geographic area.

11 QUESTION: Well, in that regard, let me ask you,
12 this is a mechanical thing, again, like moving boxes. As I
13 understand the policy it is that they have got five years,
14 one year to negotiate for substitution. And whoever takes
15 their place on the spectrum has to provide comparable
16 facilities and pay all of the relocation costs.

17 And two questions. One, suppose the end of the
18 five-years comes and the Public Safety people says, that's
19 not good enough. What you're offering me is no good. I
20 mean it doesn't satisfy. Is the FCC the arbitrator there as
21 to whether or not--I just want to know how it works--is the
22 FCC the arbitrator and says, yes, it is, or no, it isn't.

23 MR. CARR: Yes.

24 QUESTION: Okay, that answers that.

25 The next part of the question is, you say that if

1 after a year the Public Safety is in their new home and they
2 don't like their new home, the roof leaks or that sort of
3 thing, then they can go back to their old place on the
4 spectrum, is that correct?

5 MR. CARR: Yes, that's correct.

6 QUESTION: So that sounds like--I am trying to put
7 that in place with your rationale of the Commission that we
8 have, everybody's got to get off this, I mean all the old
9 people have to get off the spectrum in order to make room
10 eventually for this newly emerging technology. But you
11 could have two instances, could you or am I not
12 understanding technologically?

13 One, somebody might get off and have to come back
14 on again. Probably not too many people but it is a
15 possibility. The second, could you have a situation where
16 nobody makes an offer to these guys, of the Public Safety--

17 MR. CARR: Absolutely.

18 QUESTION: --Public Safety people? They just,
19 nobody comes along and makes an offer which satisfies the
20 policy and so they stay there indefinitely?

21 MR. CARR: That is absolutely a possibility.

22 QUESTION: How does that fit in with the
23 Commission's vision of this spectrum being completely taken
24 up with the new technologies?

25 MR. CARR: Well, the Court should keep in mind

1 that relocation under the Commission's plan will occur only
2 if the new technology provider, the PCS provider, actually
3 needs the spectrum.

4 QUESTION: Right, it's a market thing, in other
5 words?

6 MR. CARR: That's right. Now, the Commission is
7 projecting that PCS is going to attract a lot of interest,
8 there's going to be a considerable amount of demand for it,
9 and that eventually the PCS providers will take up all of
10 the spectrum that has been allocated to PCS.

11 But if the Commission is wrong about that
12 projection, there is always the possibility that the Public
13 Safety incumbents will never have to move because the PCS
14 doesn't develop

15 QUESTION: What about the point that Mr. Lane
16 makes that they're facing higher operating costs at the new
17 place along the spectrum?

18 MR. CARR: Well, Your Honor, it's not clear to me
19 where that is in the record. They haven't identified it,
20 and

21 QUESTION: It could be though, it could be,
22 couldn't it?

23 QUESTION: Suppose it were true? Would it be
24 fully comparable if it were higher operating costs? You
25 promised full comparability.

1 QUESTION: I suspect your answer is you would
2 rather not answer it, because I think that's going to be a
3 heck of a fighting issue down the line?

4 MR. CARR: Well, frankly, it isn't entirely clear.
5 What I can tell you, Judge Edwards, though is that the
6 comparable facilities have been defined by the Commission,
7 at least as a benchmark, at Joint Appendix 229, in the third
8 report and order.

9 The Commission talks about how, if a case is
10 brought to the Commission for a resolution the dispute about
11 what is comparable we will use as our benchmark that
12 comparable facilities must be equal to or superior to
13 existing facilities.

14 QUESTION: Doesn't that necessarily imply that it
15 couldn't be higher operating costs? I mean I don't mean to
16 make counsel's argument for him in the next proceeding, but
17 doesn't that necessarily imply that?

18 MR. CARR: Well, that's certainly one way of
19 reading it, Your Honor, I'm not sure if I--

20 QUESTION: It didn't occur to you until today,
21 though, did it?

22 MR. CARR: Well, frankly, Your Honor, it's because
23 the operating costs issue wasn't raised in the briefs. This
24 is the first time I've seen it and the Court seems mystified
25 as to the argument as well. I haven't seen it.

1 QUESTION: You didn't actually explain in your
2 brief what was at stake on the move either. I mean, frankly
3 reading these briefs I thought maybe there was something
4 wrong with me--everybody seems to assume there is some
5 consequence, some injury in being moved and we can't figure
6 out what it is.

7 MR. CARR: Well, actually, Your Honor, I don't
8 think that the Commission's position at this point is that
9 there will be any injury. They--

10 QUESTION: Well, then why is there Article III
11 standing if there is no injury?

12 MR. CARR: I think they, at least, have standing
13 to argue that the Commission's judgment in determining that
14 Service will not be disrupted is incorrect.

15 QUESTION: I'm not sure you are familiar with
16 Article III, they have to have an injury to have set. It's
17 puzzling. An injury does not come about because the FCC is
18 dumb. There has to have some consequence--

19 MR. CARR: A lot of petitioners would beg to
20 differ with you on that, Your Honor, but--

21 QUESTION: No, you can take that as a given. But
22 there has to be some consequences that flow from the FCC
23 being dumb or wrong or something. Somebody's got to be
24 hurt.

25 MR. CARR: Fair enough.